

# M E M O I R S O F L I T E R A T U R E.

MONDAY, May 18. 1713.

## I.

### A FURTHER ACCOUNT of Father DANIEL's History of France.

**W**HEN \* an Historian, says Father Daniel, is sufficiently provided for so great an Enterprise, as that of a general History of a Nation, he ought to consult himself, in order to know whether he has all the other necessary Qualifications to succeed in the Execution of his Project. If a Man undertakes to raise a great Edifice, and has all the Materials requisite for it, he must be able to make a Choice, and a good Use of them. With the finest Stones and the best chosen Timber, an unskilful Architect will make a Building of a very ill Taste: In like manner, an Historian, notwithstanding his Knowledge of Antiquity and Books, will write a very sorry History, if he knows not how to handle and dispose his Matter to the best Advantage. A Composition requires a great deal of Art and Judgment: The Matter and Form of it ought to be considered.

The Matter of an History consists of Facts: An Historian discovers his Judgment by the Choice he makes of them; for he must not insert in his History every thing

that he finds in his Memoirs: He must be directed upon this Head by the Nature of the History which he writes.

There are several Sorts of History. Some are general Histories of a whole Nation: Others concern only a Province, a City, an Abby, a Family, a private Person.

A Writer ought to make a different Choice of Facts in those several Sorts of History. An History, whatever it be, ought to contain every thing that is essential to its principal Object. Thus a Reader must find in the History of a City, of an Abby, or of a Family, all the considerable Transactions, that may give a perfect Knowledge of them.

The same ought to be said, in proportion, of those Memoirs, wherein an Author designs to write the History of a single Person: Nothing ought to be omitted, that deserves to be mentioned, in order to shew his Character, the Progress of his Fortune, his Intrigues, and Disappointments, the Occasions wherein he signalized himself, his Virtues, and his Imperfections, in a word, every thing that will give a perfect Notion of him.

But what is important in a particular History, ceases to be so in a general one; because what belongs to the principal Object in a particular History, is frequently of no Moment in a general History. The Prince and the State are the Object of the History of a Kingdom, or a Nation; and private Persons ought to be mentioned more or less, according as they have a Relation to either of them. Generals of Armies, Ministers of State,

\* The first Part of this Account may be seen in the last Memoirs.

State, and Governors of Towns, appear in a general History for no other Reason. If in the Description of a Battle, an Historian takes Notice of an Action of a particular Officer, or Soldier; 'tis because that Action was attended with Consequences advantageous to the State; or because it has something in it so singular, that the Glory of it redounds to the whole Nation; or because it is so wonderful, and affords so great a Pleasure to the Reader, that the Historian may easily be justified upon that Account. Thus, for the same Reason, a Writer would not adorn, but rather spoil an History of that Nature, if he should insert in it Amorous Intrigues, or Quarrels and Differences between private Persons, unless, as it frequently happens, they have occasioned some considerable Event, wherein the State was concerned; for in such a Case, they would make an essential Part of History.

There is hardly any Fault more observable in the Writers of the Ancient History of France, than such an unreasonable Detail. Those Historians have inserted all the inconsiderable Facts mentioned by *Gregorius Turonensis*, the Banishment of a Deacon, the Execution of a Count or Duke, the ill Usage of a Bishop, and a Thousand such things, interspersed through the most material Transactions. So many insignificant Particulars make an History flag, and tire the Reader.

The French History of the Second Race, and of the Beginning of the Third, has been filled up with the Wars of particular Lords, without any Choice, and without distinguishing those Wars wherein the Sovereign was concerned, from those in which he had no Hand, because they were indifferent to him, being only occasioned by the mutual Animosity of those petty Tyrants, whom he could not keep within Bounds. The taking of a small Castle, the burning of a Borough, the wasting of a Tract of Land, are not very important Transactions, unless they be attended with Consequences, wherein the whole Nation is involved; and when an Historian entertains the Readers with such things, he may be said to abuse their Patience: This Fault proceeds from no other Cause but this, viz. that those Historians had not a true Idea of a general History.

If it be the Duty of an Historian to leave out all minute and insignificant things, much less ought he to insert those that have

no Relation to his History. To what Purpose, for Instance, does *Mezeray* add at the End of the Reign of *Clovis*, after he had mentioned his Burial, *That Boethius was writing at that time the sweet Consolations of his Philosophy, against the Tyranical Usage, which he met with from Theodoric King of the Eastern Goths*; and several other things of that Nature, which have no manner of Relation to his Subject. Many French Historians have adorned the End of the Reign of the Kings of France with the like Rhapsodies. One would think an Historian should consider what Difference there is between the History of a Nation, and a general Chronicle. The Rules of the former confine the Writer to a certain Subject; whereas the Author of a Chronicle may be allowed to compile, and to insert all manner of things in it.

Though it be true, without any Exception, that an Historian ought to confine himself to his Subject, without adding to it any thing foreign to the Purpose; yet he does not offend against that Precept, when he launches out into some Digressions, which very much contribute to the Beauty of History, and which for that Reason, and much more because the things contained in them, have a Connexion with the principal Subject, should not be called by that Name. On the contrary, for Want of such Digressions, History is deprived of one of its greatest Ornaments. Father Daniel gives two Instances of such Digressions: I shall only mention one.

As soon as *Clovis*, says he, made himself Master of Gaul as far as the River Loire, *Theodoric*, King of Italy, thought it necessary to stop the Progress of that Conqueror, whose Power could not increase without being prejudicial to him. From that time he took hold of all Opportunities to disappoint the Designs of *Clovis*, and to put an End to his Conquests.

Since *Theodoric* acts such a considerable Part in the History of France, an Historian, far from offending against the Rules of Art by giving an exact Character of that Prince, and shewing by what Steps he attained to so great a Power, would deprive the Reader of the Satisfaction of knowing well a Man, who appears so often upon the Stage.

The Author having made these Observations upon the Master of History, proceeds to treat of its Form,

The

The Composition of an History, says he, requires Order, Exactness, a good Style, Dignity, Purity in the Language, a lively Narration, in a word, every thing that may keep up the Attention, not only of a Curious Reader who desires to be instructed, but even of an idle Reader, who reads only for his Diversion.

Father Daniel says, he gives the Idea of a Writer perfectly skilled in the Art of Composing, as Juvenal gives us the Character of a perfect Poet, such as he had never seen, *Et gustem nequeo monstrare, & sentio tantum.* The Author adds, that a Writer would be very presumptuous, if he should pretend to draw himself in such a Picture; but 'tis certain, that as soon as he undertakes to write, he ought to come as near that Idea of Perfection as he can.

The best Way to succeed is to pitch upon a good Model. We have good Models in Antiquity, and in our Age, wherein some Writers have treated some Points of History with great Ability. Among the Ancient Latin Historians, *Livy*, *Cæsar*, *Tacitus* and *Sallust* are generally proposed. Father Daniel says, he prefers *Livy* and *Cæsar* to the others; and he adds, that he could give very good Reasons for it, if he was to compare together those Excellent Masters. But he believes that it is with History as it is with Painting. There are many good Painters, though their Manners be very different: There are also many good Historians, though their Characters be not the same. When a Picture, exposed to the publick View, charms all those who are Judges of Painting, it must be a good Picture, whether it comes near the Manner of *Titian*, *Raphael*, or *Carsche*. When an Historian pleases, without ever tiring the Reader, he is a good Writer, whether he took *Livy* for his Model, or *Cæsar*, or *Tacitus*, or *Sallust*.

But as a Picture is never generally approved by those who understand Painting, unless it be made according to the Rules of Art; in like manner, an History, composed without Regularity, will never afford the same Pleasure to the Reader, as if the Historian had carefully observed the Precepts of the Historical Art. 'Tis true, there are some Histories well approved, though they hardly discover any Art: Such is the History of *Philip de Comines*. But it ought to be considered, that the Excellence of that

Work proceeds from the Matter, and the judicious Reflections of the Author, and that it would be much more esteemed, if he had been able or willing to give it a more regular Form.

There are certainly Rules for the Composition of an History, as well as for the Composition of an Oration, a Dramatick Piece, and an Epic Poem. Those Rules have not been followed by many French Historians; which is doubtless one of the Reasons why they create such a Disgust: For though every body does not know the Precepts of an Art, yet most Men are sensible of the ill Effect arising from the Ignorance of those Precepts.

One of the most Essential is that, which concerns the Order and Disposition of Matters, from whence arises a Clearness spread through the whole Work, and not to be found in the general Histories of France. On the contrary, there is a certain Perplexity in those Histories, which makes the Reader uneasy, and occasions a great Confusion in the Memory; and therefore they do not afford the Pleasure and Usefulness of History; one of which consists in being well pleased with the reading of things past, and the other in remembering them.

An Historian must endeavour to imitate in this essential Point the Ancient and several Modern Writers, such as *d'Avila*, *Strada*, and some others, who cannot be read too much, in order to get that regular Way of Composing, whereby every thing appears in its proper Place. Horace expresses it in these Words:

*Ordinis hæc virtus erit & Venus, aut ego fallor,  
Ut jam nunc dicat, jam nunc debentia dici;  
Pleraque differat, & præsens in tempus omittat.*

This Precept concerns History no less than the Poem mentioned by that Author. For it is not always proper to set down Matters of Fact one after another, according to the Order of Time; and that very Order, if it be scrupulously observed, occasions no small Confusion in History.

This Confusion is observable in the History of the First and Second Races, when the French Monarchy was divided among many Sovereigns. The French Historians, like *Gregorius Turonensis*, are always going and coming from the Kingdom of Paris into that

of *Soissons*; from that of *Soissons* into that of *Austrasia*, and from thence into the Kingdom of *Burgundy*. What they say, looks like so many different Histories, which for Want of Connexion, distract and confound the Reader by a Multitude of different Objects.

To prevent such an Inconvenience, an Historian ought to take an exact Survey of those Facts, that must be related. There are Two Sorts of them, *viz.* the most important with respect to the Prince and the State; and others, which, though less material, ought not to be forgotten. The former have generally an Affinity with things transacted in other States; from whence it appears, that those things ought not to be separated in the Narration. Those Facts ought therefore to be put together, and interwoven one with another; and then by such a mutual Dependance, they have each of them their proper place, and make up one and the same History; by which Means they may be more easily remembred.

As for what concerns those Facts, that are not so important, and consequently do not require a Large Extent, a skilful Historian ought to insert them in the Body of the Narration, as it were by the by, and in such a manner as not to break the Thread of it. Thus there will be in History a Sort of Unity, which is no less requisite in such a Performance, than in a Romance, a Dramatick Piece, or an Epic Poem.

In the French History of the Third Race, a Writer is free from that Perplexity of many Sovereigns, which gives as much Trouble to an Historian, as if he was writing the History of several Nations; but he will find it still very difficult to insert every thing in its proper Place.

He must always remember what Difference there is between Annals and a regular History. In Annals, or in a Chronicle, the Disposition of Matters is determined by Chronology. A Writer inserts, for Instance, in one Year the Causes of a certain Event; in the next, the Event it self; and in the Third, the Consequences of that Event. If such a Method was observed in an History, it would be very dry and tedious. An Episode, thus divided and interrupted by other Facts that have no Relation with it, loses its Gracefulness. Men naturally love to see a Cause attended with its Effect, and to have their Curiosity immediately satisfied. Upon

such Occasions, which are very frequent in History, a Writer ought to have a greater Regard to the Series of Things, than to the Order of Time, that he may unite those Things which should not be divided.

But it happens sometimes that an important Affair, a Negotiation, for Instance, lasts many Years; that a Plot is a long time contriving; that the Intrigues of the Conspirators are sometimes discovered, and sometimes renewed; and that the Conspiracy breaks out, but long after. Must an Historian follow in such a Case the Method just now mentioned? Must he, that the Readers may not lose the Sight of a Point of History which he has begun to treat, leave behind him the Transactions of Two or Three Years, and then return to them, when he has brought that Point to a Conclusion? Father Daniel does not believe it: He thinks that upon such an Occasion an Historian may take another Course; but he must be very careful not to break the Thread of the Narration too abruptly. He must carry on the thing, till he meets with some proper Conjunction, that may be, as it were, a resting Place for the Reader. And to apply this Rule to a Conjuration, he may leave off speaking of it at the Time when it has been discovered, giving to understand that it will be renewed; and after he has given an Account of other Events, he must find out a Way that will naturally bring him again to his former Subject.

The same Method ought to be observed in Proportion, when many considerable things offer themselves together without any Dependance one from another; for Example, a War upon the Frontiers of the Low Countries, another towards the Pyrenees, a Third beyond the Alpes, and at the same time a Negotiation for a Peace, as it happens sometimes in the French History. The Disposition of so many Things, transacted in different Places, is very difficult, especially when a Writer is obliged to cut off some of them, that he may not leave the others too far; and when he resumes those which he had begun without finishing them, he must chiefly take Care to bring into the Reader's Mind, by a proper Transition, a general Idea of what has been said, that he may easily resume the Thread of the Narration.

After all, 'tis impossible to propose a general Method upon this Head. An Histori-

an must always have in his Thoughts the Clearness of History, and the Satisfaction of the Reader: He must, whilst he is writing, fancy that he is a Reader, and judge by that Means what is fit to be said in one place, and what in another.

It is a great Perfection for an Historian to dispose such a Multitude of different Objects in good Order, and to insert every thing in its proper place; but this is not sufficient: Things must be also set off and adorned. The Disposition of a Picture may be very fine; and yet the Colouring will be very bad, the Figures lame and ill proportioned, and offer nothing to the Eyes but what is dry and monstrous. Such will be the Fate of an Historian, if he has no Style, or knows not how to use that which is proper for an History.

It may be said of most of those, who have writ a general History of *France* in the French Language, that they are far from being valuable on Account of their Style. A Man of Taste cannot read Two Pages in their Works, without observing that Imperfection. The best Way to be convinced of it, is to compare their Way of Writing with that of several particular Histories, which have been composed within these Thirty or Forty Years. That Difference proceeds from a certain Turn, and Sorting of Things, Thoughts, Expressions, Reflections, and Transitions, which make what we call Style; the Perfections or Defects whereof may be more easily perceived than explained.

The Style of History ought to be Noble, but Simple and Natural. It is in such a Style that *Cæsar* writ his fine Commentaries. That Style must be also lively, clear and precise. Had *Mezeray* been sensible of the Nobleness and Dignity that becomes History, he would have left out many trivial Sayings, Proverbs, sorry Jests, and mean Expressions.

Simplicity does not admit Rhetorical Figures and Amplifications, or too frequent Metaphors and Comparisons. History has an Eloquence peculiar to it, very different from that of the Bar and Pulpit. That Eloquence consists in a just Description of the Characters of Men, and of their Actions, Manners, and Passions, with short and lively Reflections arising from the Subject it self.

The Precision, as well as the Simplicity

of History, does hardly admit of Common Places, though many Historians seem to have prescribed such a Law to themselves as to begin each Book, and sometimes each Chapter of their History with some Strokes of that Nature. Nothing makes a Reader more impatient than those Preambles, which he neither desires, nor expects. They must be fine and short, not to produce such an Effect; and 'tis certain they ought not to be frequent.

An *Exordium* in Point of History must not be far-fetched. A brief and perspicuous Account of the Scene that is to be opened, if it has something great in it, is generally the best and finest Introduction. Instead of it, a judicious and solid Reflection upon what has been already said in relation to what follows, or a mere Transition, is sufficient to begin the following Book, or the next Reign: Nay, it frequently happens that a bare continued Narration has something graceful in it. The Subject affords of it self a Thousand different Ways, that may be used at different Times for Variety sake.

The Style ought to be natural, that is, without any Affectation. Art and Wit must prevail through the whole Work; but without discovering themselves. An History, interspersed with Antitheses and ingenious Strokes, pleases the Reader at first, and tires him at last. Men desire to be entertained in a Book, as in a Conversation, that is, after a natural Manner. They are well pleased with a Man who speaks naturally; and could not endure him, if his Discourse went always in a Cadence. In a word, *Cæsar* and *Livy* did not write so. *Virgil*, who may be looked upon as the most Excellent Model of Narration, did not think, though a Poet, that he might be allowed to be continually profuse of Wit in his *Aeneis*; and his Judgment directed him in that Point, as in all others. Those lively Strokes have a good Effect, when they are not heaped up one upon another. They enliven a Narration, adorn a Reflection, and set off a Character. In this, as in all other things, an Historian ought to know how to keep within due Bounds.

The Shortness of the Narration consists in a just Extent, without which it would not be short, but lame. The Narration may be said to be short and precise, when an Historian leaves out all needless Digressions.

sions and Circumstances; when his Reflections are not too frequent, and his political Arguments groundless; when he has a close Expression, free from Periphrases and unnatural Turns, like those of an Author who is not Master of his Style.

The Clearness of the Style proceeds from an Expression well disposed, and free from Ambiguities, from an Expression which is not interrupted by Parentheses, nor perplexed with entangled Phrases, or too long Periods. Which is the Reason why Amiot's Translation of *Plutarch* is still in great Esteem.

The Art of Transitions, whereby the several Parts of the Narration are linked together, is none of the easiest: They are in a Body of History, like the Joints and Ligaments in the Human Body. Matters of Fact, inserted one after another without any Connexion, will not make a Whole, but an unformed Heap.

A Transition being to join together what goes before and what follows, ought to have a Relation with both. There are a Thousand Ways of proceeding from one Subject to another. Those that are worn out, trivial, and mean, ought to be avoided & such as these in Mezeray: *Don't go about therefore to understand those small Factions, which the Historians of those Times have left in great Confusion; but observe, &c. You will not read hereafter such frequent Cruelties.* But before we proceed to the Second (Race), let us see what was the State of France under the Merovingians. You have read not long ago, how the Neustrian and the Germanick made War one with another. This Sort of Dialogue between the Historian and the Reader does not suit with the Majesty of History.

Father Daniel makes some other Remarks upon Transitions; and then he adds, that the Historical Style is so different from all other Styles, that the best is that which differs most from them.

Besides what has been said, the Author observes that the Purity of the Language ought to be found in an Historian. It is a Gracefulness different from that of the Style; for, says he, we read still with Pleasure Montluc's Commentaries, because they are written in a lively and natural Style, though the Language be superannuated. Most of those who have writ the general History of France, had not that Talent; and

it plainly appears that Mezeray was not yet a Member of the French Academy, when he composed his History; for he would doubtless have learned in so good a School to write with greater Purity and Correctness. His Abridgment is more tolerable in that respect; but it is worse still upon other Accounts.

Our Author proceeds to those Ornaments, with which it is usual to embellish an History. The most considerable are Speeches, Sentences, and Descriptions, that is, the Characters of those who appear with the greatest Distinction.

As for what concerns Speeches, Father Daniel is of Opinion, that they should not be inserted in an History. He means such set Speeches, as are made upon a Deliberation about State-Affairs, or by a General of an Army at the Head of his Troops. The Author does not approve that Custom, though it has been practised by *Livy*, and some other Ancient Historians; because it is inconsistent with Truth, an essential Quality of History: For most of those Speeches are feigned, and a mere Production of the Historian's Mind. Some Ancient Writers ought not therefore to be imitated upon this Head, because Reason should always prevail over Authority in things of this Nature. *Cicero* seems to have been of the same Mind, speaking of those Harangues, which *Thucydides* has inserted in his History. *De Thucydide*, says he, *Orationes quas interposuit, laudare soleo; sed imitari, neque possum, si velim, neque velim, si possum \**. And *Boccaccini*, in his *Ragguaglio di Parnasso*, tells us in a pleasant Manner, that an old Man having been found reading a *Madrigal* under a Laurel with Spectacles, the thing appeared scandalous to the Senate of that Country; whereupon the old Man was unanimously condemned to read a Harangue of *Guicciardini's* History, in order to expiate that Unde-

cency.

Those Sentences, and Maxims, which contain a great Sense, are doubtless an Ornament to an History, when they appear in their proper place, when they are not too frequent, and when they come out without any Affectation, as it were, under the Pen

\* *Cicer. de Clar. Orat.*

of the Historian. *Strada*, in his fine History of the Low Countries, seems to make too great a Shew of that Sort of Ornament, so far as to print his Sentences and Maxims in a different Character. History ought to be instructive; but an Historian must not assume the Air and Tone of a Doctor. Hence it is that one of the most Learned and Polite Writers † of our Age says, speaking of *Achilles Tatius*, Author of the Romance of *Chloephon and Leucippe*, " That this Author knew not that Sentences are a great Ornament to History, when they are not proposed sententiously: Otherwise they become Magistral Lectures, and discourse rage the Reader ". The Style of History ought to be grave and pithy, and consequently sententious; but it ought to be so in its Kind, as that of *Cicero* in his several Ways of Writing. All his Works are full of Sentences without being perceived, because they are natural, and naturally inserted: They do not appear like an Ornament to the Discourse, but constitute the Body and Substance of it. Such is also the Character of *Livy's* Stile. He has but few Sentences and Maxims that look so; and yet he is so full of them, that we have seen a Book published in our Days with this Title: *Livy reduced into Maxims*. 'Tis according to this Notion that *Petronius* says, *Curandum est ne sententiae emineant extra corpus orationis expresse, sed intexto vestibus colore niteant*.

Lastly, As for what concerns Characters, it is certain that an Historian must not fail to give a full Description of those Persons, who have the greatest Share in his History. The Readers are not much concerned for others; and therefore it were not only needless, but also against the Rules of History, to break the Narration in order to draw their Characters. It is with History, as 'tis with the Stage: The principal Actors raise all the Attention.

The Characters ought to be inserted in their proper Places, and naturally; Otherwise they appear preposterous and unseemly; for they are rather a Part, than an Ornament of History. An Historian must be very careful not to draw them all after the same Model: The Turn and the Strokes

of each Character ought to be different; and the Matter ought to be so contrived, that when those Strokes are put together, they may agree with the Reader's Notion of the Persons whom they represent.

After these judicious Reflections upon History, Father *Daniel* shews by what Means he has been enabled to compose a general History of *France* more valuable, than any of those that have been published hitherto. If we want good Historians, says he, we have Learned Compilers, and Excellent Critics. *Duchesne's* Compilation is an inestimable Treasure, as well as Father *Labbe's* *Bibliothèque* of Manuscripts, and some other Books of that Nature, which the Author has made Use of.

*Stephen Pasquier*, in his *Recherches de la France*, makes a great many judicious Reflections upon the Reign of the First Kings. The Works of several Learned Bededictins, consisting of Critique and Compilation, contain many Particulars, which adorn and ascertain a great Number of Historical Facts. Such are the Works of Father *Mabillon*, and Father *d'Aubrey*: The former communicated to Father *Daniel*, among other things, the Secret History of the Abbot *Valea*, written by *Paschasius Radbertus*; wherein he has found a very particular Account of the Intrigues and Conspiracy of the Sons of the Emperor *Lewis the Debonnaire* against that Prince.

*Bollandus*, and the other Jesuits of *Antwerp*, who helped, or succeeded him in the Continuation of his great Work of the Lives of the Saints; Father *Sirmond*, in his Councils of *Gaul*; Father *la Cary*, in his Book concerning the Colonies of the same Country, afford many Epochs for the First and Second Races of the Kings of *France*. The Latin History of *Valesius*, and his *Notitia Galliarum*, are Books full of Learning, which save a great deal of Labour.

The Author says, that he will not enlarge upon many particular Histories of Provinces and Cities, though several of them ought to be read more carefully, than most of the Works just now mentioned.

The Manuscripts of the King of *France's* Library, which Father *Daniel* wanted, have been communicated to him by the Abbot *de Louvois*. He has found in the Library of President *de Lamignon*, and in that of M. *Foucault*, Counsellor of State, many Curious and Original Pieces. The first President

*Nicolas*.

† *M. Huet Origine des Romans.*

Nicolai has imparted to him his Extracts of the Memorials of the Chamber of Accompts at Paris, and the Originals themselves, when he wanted to consult them. M. Rousseau, Auditor of Accompts, has also lent him many Manuscripts collated with the Originals. The Curious Library, and the printed Works of the Abbot Baluze have been also of great Use to Father Daniel; and he is no less indebted to Cardinal de Rohan, and the Abbot d'Estrées, for the Materials, which their choice and vast Libraries have afforded him.

Father Daniel has carried his History as far as the Death of Henry IV. which happened in the Year 1610. And therefore it reaches but Twelve Years beyond that of Mezeray, which ends at the Peace of Vervins in 1598. One of the Reasons why the Author did not go farther, is, because 'tis not fit to publish the History of one's own Time, or of a Time too near it. An Historian will find it difficult, when some Persons are still living, who may be concerned in his History, to observe this Excellent Precept of Cicero, *Ne quid falsi dicere audeat, ne quid veri non audeat \**.

The Author concludes his Preface with these Lines: *May it please God, that this Work, the Matter whereof is so entertaining, may be so framed as to take up the idle Hours of young People, and keep them from reading so many ill Books, which our Age has produced to the Prejudice of Religion and good Manners. I have often begged that Favour of God, as I was writing this History.*

*The 1st Volume of this History contains 1464. Columns, the II<sup>d</sup> 1919. the III<sup>d</sup> 2020.*

---

\* The Readers may see in the II<sup>d</sup> Volume of these Memoirs, pag. 304. why Mr. de la Faille went no farther than the Year 1610. in his Annals of Toulouse.

---

## II.

### THE ORIGINAL and Right of TITHES, for the Maintenance of the

Ministry in a Christian Church, truly stated. To which is annexed the Draught of a Bill prepared to have been offered to the Parliament, in the Reign of King William and Queen Mary, Anno 1691. For the restraining of Pluralities of Benefices, with Cure of Souls. With Reasons for the said Bill. By HUMPHREY PRIDEAUX, D. D. Dean of Norwich. London: Printed for Ranev Robinson, at the Golden Lyon in St. Paul's Church-Yard. MDCCXIII. In 8vo. pagg. 327. and 30. besides the Prefaces.

THE Author has divided this Treatise into Five Chapters, the First whereof concerns the Original of Tithes.

I. Dr. Prideaux having shewed that Men are bound to worship God, even by the mere Light of Nature, infers from thence that the Ministers, appointed for that Worship, ought to have a sufficient Maintenance. But, says he, it is no easy thing to determine what Part of our Income is requisite for that Purpose, by reason of the various Circumstances of Places and Persons. "For in large Towns, where there are many Souls to be taken Care of, but little or no Territory yielding Tithes, there this Provision of a Tenth Part will not do; and in other Places, where there is a large Territory, and few or no Souls, as in the Case of several Parishes in this Realm, (for some there are, which have neither House nor Inhabitant remaining in them, and others not above one or two) there it will over-do. And therefore, as there is no Law of God to determine all Mankind to any one certain Part for this End; so neither is there any thing in the Nature of the Thing, or the Reason of Man, that can lead us thereto".

However, since no Order can be observed in any Community, wherein God is worshipped, unless this Matter be brought to a Certainty; it was found necessary to fix the Maintenance of the Ministers of God, in such a manner that this Settlement might be suffi-

sufficient in general, though it could not exactly have the same Effect in every particular Place. The Author believes, that a certain Part of every Man's Income was consecrated for that Purpose in the early Ages of the World. The Worship of God, and the Payment of Tithes for the Support of it, went together in those Days. "And if we consider," says Dr. Pridgeaux, of how general a Practice the Payment of Tithes anciently was amongst most Nations of the Earth, for the Support of the Worship of those Gods they adored, and the many Instances we have of this Usage \* among the Syrians, Phoenicians, Arabians, Æthiopians, Greeks, Romans, and other Nations, there is no other rational Account to be given, how so many different People, of various Languages, and various Customs from each other, and who also worshipped various Deities, should all come to agree so exactly in this one Matter, but that it had been an Ancient Institution Sacredly observed by the First Fathers of Mankind, and after the Flood transmitted by them in a lasting Tradition to the Nations descended from them. And if so (and what hath been said, I think, strongly proves that it was so) then we have not only the Practice of Abraham and Jacob for the separating a Tenth Part of their Increase for the Support of God's Worship, but also that of the Ancient Patriarchs, who went before them. And this I think fully proves it of Divine Original, although there be no Divine Law obliging all Mankind thereto". Dr. Pridgeaux adds, that since there was nothing in the Law of Nature, that could move those Holy Men to consecrate the Tenth Part of their Increase to the Worship of God, rather than the Ninth, or any other Part, they did it by God's Direction. Hence it is that as soon as God gave a written Law to his People, he ordered that this Tenth Part should be the Portion of the Ministers appointed for his Service.

The Author makes several Remarks upon the *Mosiacal* Law, from which he draws these

Two Inferences. 1. That the Law of Tithes, given to the *Israelites*, was, as to the determinate Part, a Law peculiar to that People, being established by God, not as Universal Governor of the World, with an Intent of obliging all Mankind to the Observance of it; but as he was in a peculiar and extraordinary Manner their King and Governor in that State of Theocracy they were under. From whence it follows, that the Law of Tithes among the *Israelites* was only a Part of that Civil Constitution, by which they were governed; and that in its Nature and Obligation it was the same with the Civil Constitutions of other States, only with this Difference, that God himself was the immediate Founder of their Commonwealth. 2. The Second Inference is this: Since Tithes were only to be paid in the Land of Canaan, to the Tribe of Levi, and for the Service of the Temple, that Law ceased to be obligatory, when the Gospel put an End to the *Mosiacal* Constitution. We find nothing concerning Tithes in the Christian Law, which was not made for one Nation, but for all Mankind; and Christians are only under a general Obligation of providing for the Maintenance of their Ministers in the most proper Way. There is scarce any thing in the New Testament more fully and strictly enjoined, as the Author shews at large.

II. In the Second Chapter, Dr. Pridgeaux undertakes to resolve this Celebrated Question, *Whether Tithes be due to the Ministers of the Gospel by Divine Right?* In order to it, he lays down the following Positions.

1. There is a Difference between a Divine Right, and a Divine Original. For though whatever is of Divine Right, must have its Original from a Divine Appointment; yet there are many things, which were first appointed by God, and consequently of Divine Original, which are not now of Divine Right.

2. A Divine Right is that which accrues from a Divine Law; and therefore to create in any thing a Divine Right, there must be a Divine Law in full Force, commanding and requiring that thing from us. This Divine Law ought to be either Natural or Positive. The Natural Law is that, which God writ in our Hearts from the Beginning, and by which all Moral Duties are of Di-

S  
vins

\* Concerning this, see Selden of Tithes, Chap. 3. Spencer de Legibus Hebraeorum, lib. 3. c. 10. §. 1.

vine Right due from us. The Positive Law of God is that, which was given by Divine Revelation: That Law is either particular or general. It is particular, when given only to particular Persons, or to a particular Nation, or when appointed only with respect to the particular Times, in which it was given, without laying any Obligation upon succeeding Ages. A general positive Law of God is that, which concerns all Mankind, without any Exception of Persons, Times, or Places.

3. A Thing is said to have only a Divine Original, when it has been appointed by God, without a Divine Law obliging all Mankind to the Observance of it.

4. The Practice of Holy Men Divinely inspired and Divinely directed, does not prove a Divine Right; but it does very well prove a Divine Original.

5. In the Matter of Tithes, there are Two Things to be considered: *First*, The Maintenance of those, who officiate in Holy Things; and *Secondly*, The Determination of it to a Tenth Part of our Annual Increase.

6. That the Ministers of Religion should have a Maintenance sufficient to support them in their Ministry, is certainly of Divine Right; the Law of God, both Natural and Positive, laying an undeniable Obligation upon all Men to provide for such a Maintenance.

7. The Determination of this Maintenance to a Tenth Part of our Annual Increase is not of Divine Right; there being no Divine Law, either Natural or Positive, obliging us to it. To the Jews it was of Divine Right, because they had a Divine Law requiring it from them; but this Law not reaching us, and there being none other given, either before or after the Law, that requires it from all Mankind, it must be confessed that there is no Foundation to lay Claim to this particular Part, as being due of Divine Right, exclusive of all other Means and Provisions, which may be made for this Purpose instead of it.

8. Though the Payment of Tithes be not of Divine Right; yet it is of Divine Original.

9. Since Tithes had their Original from God, and it was by his Direction that they were paid by Holy Men before the Law, and by his Command that they were appointed

among the *Israelites* under the Law; this reaches us as a *Divine Precedent*, though not as a *Divine Law*; and as far as a Precedent can be obligatory in any Government, it does, in God's Government of the World, lay an Obligation upon all Mankind to do the same.

Here the Learned Dean makes several judicious Remarks upon the Nature and Obligation of *Precedents*; and then proceeds to the *Precedent* relating to Tithes. In treating this Part of his Subject, he begins with stating the Case; and, in the next place, he shews what Obligation arises from the Precedent, which God has given us about Tithes.

As for what concerns the State of the Case, it is agreed on all Hands that the Law of God from the Beginning, which has been ratified and confirmed by the Gospel, requires that a Ministry should be maintained for the Support of his Worship, and consequently that a Portion of every Man's Substance should be set apart for this Purpose. What that Portion is to be in this or any other Land is the Case, which falls under this Law to be determined. The Law of God teaches us in general, that his Ministers ought to have a sufficient Maintenance; and therefore that Maintenance must be determined by the End and Intent of that Law, which is the Support of God's Worship in such a manner, as will best tend to God's Glory, and Man's Everlasting Salvation. That Part therefore of our Income, which will make up such a Maintenance for God's Ministers, as will best enable them to answer this End, must be the Part which is to be consecrated to this Purpose. From whence it appears, that the Decision of this Case depends wholly on the adjusting of the Means to the End, that is, the proportioning the Maintenance of God's Ministers to the Support of his Worship. This must be done, either distinctly for every particular Place or Parish, or else by one uniform Rule for the whole Community. To do it the former Way would lay the Burden very unequally upon those, who are to bear it, that is, more in one Place and less in another, according as in one Place more and in another less would appear sufficient for the End intended; and after all the Care that could be taken, it would be scarce possible to look through every Circumstance necessary to be considered.

red in adjusting of this Point, so as exactly to hit it. Nay, supposing it could be done, the doing of it would be attended with so many Perplexities, Difficulties, and Confusions, and so many Reasons would continually require an Alteration of the Proportion stated, that this Method would be utterly impracticable. This shews the Necessity of one uniform Rule concerning this Matter in every Community. Here Two Things are to be attended to : First, The Burden must be made equal to all those, who are to bear it : Secondly, The Portion to be set apart must be sufficient for the End intended. The First will be fully answered by fixing it to one certain Part of every Man's Income. But what that Part is, which will best answer the other, is the Difficulty. To fix on such a Part for the whole, as may exactly be sufficient in every particular Place, is impossible, both because of the Inequality of the Territories, into which Parishes are divided, and also the Inequality in the Merits, Sufficiency, and other Qualifications and Circumstances of the Ministers : And therefore all that can be done in this Matter, is to appoint such a Part for the whole, as may be, as near as possible, sufficient for the whole, and which for the most part will best provide for every Particular, so that, if there be any Defect, it may proceed only from the unavoidable Inequality of the Distribution.

Thus the Matter is reduced to this Question : *What is the fittest Portion of our Substance to be set apart in every Community, for the Support of God's Worship in the Maintenance of those, who minister in it?* The Law of God has not determined this Question : We are only commanded by it to provide for the Maintenance of God's Ministers. But we have God's Precedent to direct us in the Execution of that Law, because when he founded the Commonwealth of *Israel*, he allotted the Tenth Part of every Man's yearly Income to the Ministers of Religion. The Author undertakes to shew, that this Precedent obliges us to do the same in the like Case, and he proves it by several Reasons. 1. Because it is God's Precedent. 2. Because we can no where else have a sure Guide to direct us in the present Case. 3. Because, when God gives us his Precedent, we cannot vary from it without offering Indignity to him. Dr. *Pridesaux* enlarges upon these

Three Reasons, and answers an Objection that might be made against them, viz. that the Case is altered. It will be objected, that the Tithes prescribed by God were only for the *Levitical* Priesthood, under the *Mosaical* Oeconomy, and calculated only for the Land of *Canaan*; and therefore that Priesthood with the whole Oeconomy being abolished, and we now being under a different Priesthood, and a different Oeconomy, this makes such an Alteration in the Case, that the Precedent is not applicable to it, and therefore it can be of no Force to oblige us to do the same.

In Answer to this Objection, the Author denies, *First*, That the Alteration of the Priesthood makes any Alteration in the present Case, or that there ever were any Reasons for the Payment of the Tenth Part to the *Levitical* Priesthood, which do not hold good, for the same Payment to the Christian; and therefore the Change of the Order can be no Argument for the Change of the Maintenance.

If the Ministers of the Christian Religion do not deserve that Tithes should be paid to them, as they were paid to the Ministers appointed by the Law of *Moses*, it must be for one of these following Reasons. 1. Because the Work and Duty of the Christian Priesthood is lesser, than that of the *Levitical*. 2. Because the Qualifications necessary to the Ministers of the Gospel, are inferior to those that were requisite in the Ministers of the *Mosaical* Law. 3. Because the Christian Priesthood is not so valuable. 4. Because it does not require so great Charges for the Maintenance of it 5. Because it is otherwise sufficiently provided for. 6. Because so great a Number of Ministers is not necessary under the Christian Oeconomy. The Author confutes all those Arguments in the following Manner.

1. It cannot be denied, that the Work of the Christian Priesthood is far greater, than that of the *Jewish* Ministers. The latter were only to attend the Service of the Sanctuary, not constantly, but once in Four and Twenty Weeks. For the Priests, as well as the *Levites*, were divided † into Four

---

† *Maimonides in Kele Hammikdash*, cap. 2. Sect. 9. and cap. 4. Sect. 3. 1 *Chron. c. 24*, and 25.

and Twenty Courses, each of which went up to *Jerusalem* to serve a Week in its Order; the Priests to attend the Offering of Incense, Sacrifices, and Oblations; and the *Levites* to be Porters, and Singers, and to perform all other Offices under the Priests. Each Course being subdivided into Seven Classes, each Class served its Day; and when the Week was over, they went home, and were succeeded by another Course. From whence it appears, that no Priest or *Levite* served more than Two Days in a Year, excepting the great Festivals. When they were at home, they had nothing to do with respect to their Sacerdotal Office, till their Course came about again: Besides, they were allowed to go to the War, to till the Ground, and to do any other Business, like other Men.

'Tis true, the Scripture says, || *the Priests Lips should keep Knowledge, and the People should seek the Law at their Mouth*. But this was only understood in this Sense, that they should be ready to instruct all those, who consulted them, in all the Rites and Ceremonies of the Law, and enable them to perform those Rites and Ceremonies in such a Manner as God required.

As for the Synagogues of the *Jews*, in which publick Prayers were constantly performed, and Sermons preached every Sabbath-day, to instruct the People in the Duties of Religion; the Priests and *Levites* were not obliged to attend that Service. The Ministers of the Synagogues were indifferently chosen out of every Tribe. Each Synagogue had Ten Ministers; and in the Time of our Saviour there were \* Four Hundred and Eighty Synagogues in *Jerusalem* only, by which one may judge what their Number was through the whole Land. Besides the Tithes, First-Fruits, and Oblations, which the People paid to the Priests and *Levites*, they were also obliged to maintain the Ministers of their Synagogues. It appears from what has been said, that the

Ministers of the Gospel have a much greater Work, than those of the *Mosaical Law*, since they must administer the Sacraments, preach constantly the Word of God, take upon them the Care of Souls, and daily watch over them. Their Office takes up all their Time, and allows them no Leisure for any other Employment. Besides, they are forbidden by the Law of this Realm †, under great Penalties and Forfeitures, to engage in any other Work.

2. The Qualifications requisite in the Ministers of the New Covenant are much above those of the *Levitical Priesthood*. The whole Duty of the latter consisting only in the Service of the Sanctuary, in offering Sacrifices, Incense, and Oblations, no Endowments of the Mind, either Natural or Acquired, were necessary for the Performance of it; and therefore in order to be admitted to the Priesthood, they were only examined upon these Three Heads || 1. Whether they were of the true Sacerdotal Line legitimately descended. 2. Whether they were of the full Age, which the Law required for their Admission. 3. Whether they were free from all Bodily Blemish. After such an Examination, they were immediately admitted into their Office, though they wanted all other Qualifications. But it is quite otherwise with the Christian Priesthood. The Ministers of the Gospel being to preach the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, and to defend it against all Opposers, must needs have a sound Judgment, and a great Knowledge, not only of the Scripture, but also of many other things, which are not to be acquired but by long Study, hard Labour, and a chargeable Education.

3. The Excellency of the Gospel does very much exceed that of the *Mosaical Law*; and therefore it cannot be doubted, that the Christian Priesthood is much more valuable than the *Levitical*.

4. The Office of the Ministers of the Christian Religion is more chargeable, than that of the *Levitical Priesthood*, which consisted only in Bodily Labour; and there-

---

† *Maimonides Kele Hammikdash*, cap. 4. Sect. 11.

|| *Malachi* 11. 7.

\* *Talmud Hierosol. in Megillah* fol. 73. col. 4. *Rabbi Solomon in Esaiam*, cap. 11. v. 1.

† *Statute A. 21. H. 8. c. 13.*

|| *Maimonides in Biath Hammikdash* c. 6.

fore any Man of that Race, who had no Imperfection in his Body, and had attained a full Age, was judged sufficiently qualified for the Discharge of that Ministry.

Besides, they had no particular Districts for the Execution of their Office, but lived together in the Cities, that were assigned them. Each of them had not his particular Work in the Priesthood: It was divided to them by Lot at the Time of their Ministration: And though they went to *Jerusalem*, when their Courses came; yet this was but Twice in a Year; and then they were at no Expence, being maintained out of the Sacrifices; and whenever they officiated, they had a Reserve over and above for the Support of their Families. Thus they were in all Things, as to their Way of Living, on the same Level with others, and no way obliged by reason of their Office to any greater Expence, than if they had been without it. But the Case of the Christian Priests is quite different. They ought to be Men of Parts and Learning: Their Education is chargeable. Besides, they have their particular Districts or Parishes, where they officiate, and live as publick Persons. They are frequently resorted to; which occasions no small Expence: And it is their Duty to be Hospitable, and Charitable to the Poor. These Considerations plainly shew, that the Office of the Ministers of the Gospel is attended with much greater Charges, than that of the Sons of *Levi*.

5. It cannot be said, that the *English Clergy* want no Tithes, because they are otherwise sufficiently provided for. "Although most Churches among us have Manles and Glebes, and were most of them originally founded in them; yet these fall vastly short of a sufficient Maintenance, and are so far from being an equivalent to the Tithes, that it would be well, if they could in this Land Half make Amends for what is by Compositions, Customs, and Prescriptions, deducted from them; besides what is lost by the Concealments, and Frauds of those, who are to pay them. Moreover, if we take the Precedent from the *Levitical Priesthood* in its utmost Rigour, it will plead for much more than the Tithes, which are now claimed for the Maintenance of the Christian Priesthood. To answer our Glebes, they had their Forty Eight Cities assigned them to dwell

" in, which with the Suburbs or Fields adjoining made about \* a Thirtieth Part of the Land of *Canaan*; a Proportion to the whole, which all the Glebes and Church-lands in this Kingdom do not by much amount to". The Author adds, that there was a Second Tithing, in which the *Levites* had also a great Share. Besides those Second Tithes, and the Cities above mentioned, they had a great many Emoluments and Perquisites, which vastly increased their Revenue above that of the Christian Ministry in this Kingdom. The Author gives a List of all those Perquisites out of *Mammonides*; and then makes this Curious Observation. ' If we put together, says he, the Glebes and Church-Lands in this Realm, they will not come to above One Hundred Thousand Pound per Annum. What belongs to Bishops, and Deans, and Chapters, at the largest Computation, reckoning in their Fines as well as their Rents, I cannot make to arise higher than Seventy Five Thousand Pound per Annum; and of this at least a Third Part being in appropriated Tithes, there remains only Fifty Thousand Pound per Annum in Lands belonging to all the Bishops, and Deans, and Chapters in this Realm: And if we add thereto the Glebe-Lands belonging to Parish-Churches, Fifty Thousand Pound per Annum, I reckon, is the highest Value they can be laid at. So then the whole Income of all the Church-Lands and Glebes in *England* and *Wales*, will amount to One Hundred Thousand Pounds per Annum; which, computing the Value of all the Lands of both, that is, the whole Realm, at Fifteen Millions per Annum (as it is † usually reckoned at) is about the Hundred and Fiftieth Part of it; whereas the Cities and Lands alone assigned the *Levitical Ministry* in *Canaan* was a Thirtieth Part of that Land, which is Five times as much: And this is but one of those many Particulars, which (I have shown) did over and above their Tithes belong unto them'.

\* See *Comber of Tithes*. Part 2. c. 2. p. 10. where the Proportion is demonstrated.

† Dr. Davenant's *Discourse on the Publick Revenues, and on the Trade of England*

I shall go on with this Account in the next Memoirs.

The following Article will not be unacceptable to the Readers. I take it from the Acta Eruditorum.

---

### III.

**OBSERVATIO** circa Scientiam Universalem Sinensem, in libro Confucii, in charta Sinensi duobus spissis majoris formæ Voluminibus scripto, exhibitam: quod MStum penes ipsos Jesuitas Parisenses & Antverpienses fuit, quo tempore partem ejus mutilam ediderunt: jam vero a V. Cl. AYMONIO, Verbi Divini apud Hagienses Ministro, asservatur, qui editionem integrum meditatur.

**H**abebit vero nova editio hæc præcipua: I. Patebit inde, Jesuitas vix tertiam MSti partem publicasse in editione Paris. 1687. folio vulgata, Regique Galliæ dedicata. Illa enim non nisi 274 paginas continet, majori insuper charætere; MStum vero 950, & quidem minoribus literis, quod adeo cum proibit, duo in folio Volumina 500 minimum quodlibet paginarum constitueret. II. Deceptum esse ab iisdem Jesuitis Galliæ Monarcham, variosque Pontifices cum omnibus Sedis Romanæ Cardinalibus, qui de gravi processu, ex his materiis Theologicis, Philosophicis, moralibus, ritualibus & politicis inter Jesuitas & reliquos variorum ordinum Missionarios Sinenses nato, sententiam tulerunt. Neque enim horum Memoriæ, Relationes, Facta, aliaque scripta suffecerunt ita demonstrandis, aut tam authenticæ probandis falsis & fraudibus Jesuitarum, ut quidem apparent in his Voluminibus, ab aliquot hujus ordinis Missionariis celebrioribus scriptis, qui sane suos caræteres & signa ibidem cum approbatione Cousinii, qui potestatem imprimendi Galliæ Regis nomine fecit, exstan-

tia negare non audebunt. III. Prolixa præfatio, sub forma Dissertationis præliminaris præmittenda, cujus dimidia pars manu ipsius P. Coupletii, Generalis Missionariorum Sinensium Jesuitarum Procuratoris, scripta, evidenter in parte secunda detegit, necessariam fuisse Societati Operum Confucii depravationem, partim ut reliqui Missionarii Romæ damnarentur, partim ut a Pontifice & missiones Jesitarum, Christianismum adoptando cultum Sinensem idololatricum infucantum, & Scripta ab iisdem in Europa super diversis his materiis edita approbarentur. IV. Multa falsa maximi momenti hic indicabuntur, quæ reliqui Galliæ & Italiæ Jesuitæ commiserunt imitati P. Coupletium ejusque Collegas hac in re præeuntes, edendo hoc opus, non nisi resectis & mutatis omnibus, quæ Systemati Jesitarum videbantur adversa, suppresso insuper integro textu Sinensi, ut glossas plane sensui literali Aphorismorum Confucii aliorumque Philosophorum Sinensem contrarias substituerent. Patet hoc ex dogmatibus satis gravibus. E. g. pag. 1. §. 1. Lib. 1. textus Sinensis MSti Confucii habet: Tá tuo chi tao sai mím te: i. e. magnum Principum sciendi institutum consistit in expoliendo rationalem naturam; Jesuitæ addiderunt: a cœlo inditam, ut scilicet hæc seu lippidissimum speculum absterris prævorum appetitum maculus ad pristinam claritatem redire posset. Quibus intelligunt, animam rationalem de cœlo descendere, lumina vero ejus peccato originis esse obfuscata; cum tamen textus Sinensis de eo fileat, nec huic similia aut Confucius aut Discipuli ejus unquam scripserint. V. Ipse textus Sinensis, & quod ejus in editione Parisiensi editum & quod suppressum, apponetur, addita vera omnium terminorum Sinensem Latine translatorum significatione literali. Distinguetur præterea a falsis Jesitarum glossis minuto charætere adjiciendis, ut intelligat quisque, quid Confucium ejusque discipulos autores habeat, & quid additum aut truncatum a Jesuitis in celebri illa editione, cui reliqui omnes Sinensem Missionariorum Jesitarum libri inituntur. Poterunt ergo sententiæ in horum favorem a Pontificibus contra reliquos Missionarios, præcipue eos qui sunt e seminario missionum exoticarum Parisiensium, latè, in Aula Romana revocari, cum contenta hujus MSti non depravata prodibunt. Tradent illa veram Sinensem doctrinam, ac omnia ad cultum, disciplinam moralem & religiōnem

nem eorum spectantia, quæ nunquam ante-hac tam diffuse & plene descripta sunt. VI. Adnotabuntur præterea plusquam 500 loca ac glossæ variæ ex celeberrimis Philosophis Sinensibus desumptæ, & ad marginem imamque paginarum partem pulcherrimi hujus MSti a Jesuitis & Mandarinis, qui magnam hanc collectionem apud Sinenses compilarunt, eo fine adjectæ, ne quid scientiæ & regularum Sinensium Generalem eorum Romæ lateret; neutiquam vero, ut typis vulgantur, unde nec nisi minimam partem aliena plane specie obductam & depravatam luci publicæ exposuerunt. VII. Adjicientur figuræ hieroglyphicæ, quarum quæ maximi mysterii & momenti, in editione Parisiensi suppressæ sunt, quia exhibent consilium, quod iniverunt Jesuitæ de exauctorando Imperatore Tartarico, inque ejus locum sub-

stituendo quodam ex stirpe veterum Imperatorum Sinensium, in Scholis Jesuitarum educato & a Mandarinis & Præfatis provincialium & urbium huic Societati faventibus adjuto. Multas quippe Jesuitarum Societas in vasto hoc Imperio jam possidet regiones, in quibus metalli fodiæ, aquas, in quibus margaritæ, & portus, in quibus urbes commerciis aptissimæ: quæ omnia prætextu religionis occupavit per privilegia a Mandarinis hujus sectæ impetrata ab Imperatoribus Tartaricis, quibus multi Ministri status & Mandarinis ex ordine Jesitarum sunt. Quare eorum potentia in Aula Pequinensi factum, quod Cardinalis Turonius variique Missionarii eorum consiliis adversi carceri inclusi, frustra Pontifice ad liberandos eos omnia tentante, una cum Eminentissimo hoc Præfule perierint.

## L E I P S I C K.

M<sup>R</sup>. Walchius has published a New Edition of *Phædrus* with a Commentary.

*Phætri Fabularum Æsopiarum Libri V. quibus accesserunt Symposius, Gabrie & Antonini Liberalis Fabulae, & Publili Syri Sententiae, cum Commentariis Jo. Georgii Walchii.* Lipsiae 1713. in 12.

The same Author designs to put out a Book, *De falso & merito suspectis præjudiciis Latinae Linguae.*

## H O L L A N D.

M<sup>R</sup>. Le Clerc informs us in his *Bibliothèque Choisié* \*, that a Person of a most eminent Dignity (I fancy he means Cardinal de Polignac) has undertaken to confute *Lucrètius* in very fine Latin Verses.

\* Tom. XXVI. Part I.

The Author having said that there is nothing so great, and so worthy of our Attention, as the Creator of the World; and that he designs to attack the Doctrine of *Epicurus*, and the celebrated Poet who explained it, and by that means to bring the Muses to the Knowledge of Truth, breaks out into these Words:

Sed quid ego hic Musas? Te Causa & Regula  
[Mundi]  
Omnipotens, æterna Dei Sapientia, Virtus  
Et Mens & Ratio, vita Dux optimæ nostræ,  
Ipsaque Lux animi, te solam in vota vocabo.

Here follows another Passage concerning the Punishment of the Wicked after Death:

Nam si dum Superos tremimus, dum fulmen  
[Olympi,  
Terribilesque minas, iramque Tonantis & Orei  
Supplicia, æternosque ipsi exhorrescimus ignes,  
Peccatum tamen, & terras sceleris omnia mergunt;  
Quid si vindicta nullus timor? Undique cædes,  
Undique flagitia, atque hominem natum esse pi-  
[geret.

The

The Author addresses himself to Epicurus in the following Lines.

*Perfugium potius culpæ, solisque benignus  
Perjuris, ac fædfragis, Epicure, parabas.  
Unam hominum fæcem poteras, devotaque furcis  
Devinciretibi capita, invictaque patronus  
Nequitiae tantum, scelerisque adserior haberi,  
Cui tales animos viresque atque arma ministras.  
Degener ille bonis etenim non ingruit horror,  
Quem perimis, sibi nec restinguiri Tartara poscant,  
Quos bene gesta satis tranquillant, ipsaque morum  
Integritas, & parta quies, moderamine casto,  
Vindicat à misera longè formidine pænae.  
His procul anguicomæ strident, crepitantque fla-  
[ gellis  
Eumenides ; procul his aeterna incendia sumant.  
Præclarum officii genus & bonitatis, iniqus  
Solari, mercede sua fraudare merentes !*

## L O N D O N.

**F**our Letters, which passed between the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Sarum, and Mr. Henry Dodwell, printed from the Originals. London: Printed for Richard Smith, at the Sign of Bishop Beveridge's Head in Pater-Noster-Row, near Cheapside. 1713. In 120. Pagg. 39.

The First Letter contained in this small Book, and written by the late Mr. Dodwell, begins thus :

" Right Reverend Father in God,  
" I am glad that the Extinction of the  
" late Schism has enabled me to own your  
" Spiritual Titles, but shall be more so, if  
" a like Providence may put it in my Power  
" to acknowledge your Secular Honours al-  
" so.

At the End of this Letter, Mr. Dodwell desires the Lord Bishop of Salisbury to confirm his Children, or to give him Leave to get them confirmed by some other of his Venerable Brethren ; and then he goes on thus : " I value this Ordinance more than

" the loose *Latitudinarian* Opinions of this  
" Age would oblige me to do ; as taking it  
" for the true Baptism of the Spirit, derived  
" from the Apostles. This will make me to  
" value the more, the Favour hereby conferred  
" on my Children, if they may receive this  
" Office from you, which may entitle them  
" to so great Benefits, as are the Conse-  
" quents of the Inhabitation of the Spirit.  
" In the mean time, I beg another Boon of  
" your Prayers and Episcopal Benediction  
" upon me and mine.

Shottesbrook, I am  
near Maiden-  
head. Feb: 10.  
1710-11.

Your Fatherhood's  
Unworthy Communicants,

HENRY DODWELL.

See the next Memoirs.

I have just now received the *Journal des Scavans*, wherein the Authors give their Judgment about Father Daniel's *History of France* in the following Words. " It appears to us, that nothing is wanting to it, either in the Choice and Connexion of Historical Facts ; or in the Disposition of those Facts, and the Reflexions of the Author ; or in the Dignity and Gracefulness of the Style. Father Daniel has interspersed through his Work the most solid Maxims of Piety, without any Affectation ; and is no less successful in describing Battels, and unfolding Political Mysteries, than in setting forth Quarrels on Account of Religion. He carefully observes the different Manners and Customs of the French Nation in the different Ages of the Monarchy, and shews particularly by what Degrees they have carried the Art of War to its Perfection".

I shall give a further Account of Father Daniel's *History* in a proper time, because what I have said of that great Work in these and the foregoing *Memoirs*, is not sufficient to satisfy the Curiosity of the Readers.

---

L O N D O N : Printed by J. Roberts : And Sold by A. Baldwin,  
near the Oxford-Arms in Warwick-Lane. (Price 6 d.)